APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,499	09/14/2000	Juergen Stark	2150/21	8756

7590	12/24/2003

Brinks Hofer Giilson & Lione
P.O Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	9

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/661,499	STARK ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 May 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-61_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-61_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
             application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.
     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _5,8_ .   6)☐ Other: .

Detailed Action

Claims 1-61 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed on papers 5 and 8 have been considered.

Change of Address

The change of address received on 5/6/01 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 39 refers to the communications platform in claim 39. A claim cannot refer to itself unless it is an independent claim. Appropriate correction is required. The examiner will analyze the claim as if it was referring to the communication's platform of claim 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7, 8, and 12, 39, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said user-defined XML tag" in claim 7, lines 1 and 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the informant" in claim 8, line 3. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "said at least one endpoint" in claim 12, lines 1 and 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 39 recites the limitation "the communications platform" in claim 39, line 1. There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. See claim objects.

Claim 44 recites the limitation "said individual user" in claim 44, line 1. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Does applicant mean receiver of the

message?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al (Applicant IDS).

Claims 14-16, 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al.

Claims 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,742,763 by Jones.

Claims 38 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al.

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 1, a communications platform that enables individuals to receive XML electronic SmartMessages from corporations and others comprising a message-processing platform (Millier: col. 2, lines 6-16; organizing information), said processing platform comprising automatic intelligent routing (Millier: col. 3, lines 5-8) such that said processing platform can receive an XML-based electronic SmartMessages from an XML SmartMessage sender and route said XML-based SmartMessage on behalf of an individual user (Millier: col. 3, lines 14-25; route is similar to file; col. 3, lines 48-53; xml is a message format just like a structured storage format).

Regarding claim 2, the communications platform in claim 1, wherein said message processing platform further provides the organization, summation, filing, storage, synthesis,

formatting and intelligent processing of XML-based electronic SmartMessages (Millier: col. 3,

lines 5-8, col. 2, lines 6-16).

Regarding claim 3, the communications platform in claim 2, wherein said XML

electronic SmartMessage comprises at least one standardized XML tag (Millier: col. 3, lines 55-

57) and at least one sender defined XML tag (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5).

Regarding claim 4, the communications platform in claim 3, wherein said sender-defined

XML tag comprises an envelope, said envelope comprising a header (Millier: col. 3, lines 61-65)

and a document (Millier: col. 3, lines 65- col. 4, line 5).

Regarding claim 5, the communications platform in claim 3, wherein said sender-defined

XML tag comprises a SmartMessage definition document (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line

5), wherein said definition document is used by the communications platform to automatically

determine how to display, summarize and process the XML electronic SmartMessage (Millier:

col. 3, lines 5-8, col. 2, lines 6-16).

Regarding claim 14, a communications platform that enables individuals to receive XML

(Shigemi: col. 9, line 20) electronic SmartMessages from corporations and others comprising a

highly scalable XML messaging engine capable of receiving and storing information pertaining

to an individual user's communications environment (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 41-57; col. 9, lines

42-57).

Regarding claim 15, the communications platform in claim 14, wherein said individual

user's communication environment comprises at least one endpoint (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-

44), said at least one endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a

facsimile machine, a paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 44-57).

Regarding claim 16, the communications platform in claim 15, wherein said platform

creates rules for communication based on pre-defined system defaults (Shigemi: col. 12, lines

27-35; Figures 7, 8a, 8b, 8c; col. 13, lines 48-59).

Regarding claim 18, the communications platform in claim 15, wherein said endpoint is

automatically created by a service provider and transmitted to an individual's communication

platform (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 59- 67; the processing unit acts like a service provider).

Regarding claim 19, the communications platform in claim 18, wherein said endpoint

comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a paging

device, or a personal digital assistant (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 44-57).

Regarding claim 20, the communications platform in claim 16, further comprising a

website, said website being accessible by the users of the communications platform (Shigemi:

col. 10, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 21, the communications platform in claim 20, wherein users of said

communications platform can modify the rules of the platform by accessing the website

(Shigemi: col. 11, lines 36-54).

Regarding claim 22, the communications platform in claim 21, wherein said modification

of the rules comprises configuring at least one endpoint and routing SmartMessages (Shigemi:

col. 11, lines 36-54).

Regarding claim 23, the communications platform in claim 20, wherein said website

further comprising delivery information pertaining to informants, activity and events, and

Endpoints (Shigemi: col. 12, lines 55-64; col. 10, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 24, the communications platform in claim 16, wherein said

SmartMessage is delivered either by the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol, or the Hypertext

Transfer Protocol, to a receiving server (Shigemi: col. 9, line 46; col. 10, line 17).

Regarding claim 25, the communications platform in claim 24, wherein said

SmartMessage is further transmitted to routing and processing servers (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 51-

57; col. 2, lines 57-67), said routing and processing servers format and deliver said

SmartMessages to the intended endpoints (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 66-67; col. 8, lines 46- col. 9,

line 24).

Regarding claim 26, the communications platform in claim 25, wherein said routing and processing servers further deliver messages to other servers for formatting and delivery (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 27, the communications platform in claim 26, wherein said other servers comprise electronic mail, telephone, pager, text-to-voice, instant messaging, facsimile and US mail servers (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 37-47).

Regarding claim 32, a communications platform that enables individual users to receive electronic messages from corporations and others comprising a nickname-based routing system (Jones: col. 2, lines 26-30), said nickname-based routing system (Jones: col. 5, lines 57-64) configured to enable a sender of an electronic message to transmit to receiver said message to at least one of said receiver's endpoints by defining said endpoint (Jones: col. 2, lines 35-41).

Regarding claim 33, the communications platform in claim 32, wherein said specific user's endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Jones: col. 6, lines 36-57).

Regarding claim 34, the communications platform in claim 33, wherein said nickname-based routing system comprises at least one address containing a nickname (Jones: col. 5, lines 57-64).

Regarding claim 35, the communications platform in claim 34, wherein said nickname

comprises information pertaining to said receiver's name and endpoint (Jones: col. 5, lines 57-64;

lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 36, the communications platform in claim 35, wherein said nickname

further comprises information pertaining to said endpoint (Jones: col. 5, lines 57-64; lines 31-

36).

Regarding claim 37, the communications platform in claim 36, wherein said information

pertaining to said endpoint comprises a telephone number, a facsimile number, a pager number,

an electronic address or a resident address (Jones: col. 5, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 38, a communications platform that enables individuals to receive XML

(Shigemi: col. 9, line 20) electronic SmartMessages from corporations and others comprising a

message processing platform (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 45-67; col. 9, lines 42-57) said message

processing platform comprising at least one information folio (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 54-57;

where a folio is a node), said communication platform capable of organizing a received

SmartMessage into said at least one information folio (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 64-67).

Regarding claim 45, the communications platform in claim 39, further comprising a

website, wherein said at least one information folio is can be accessed for review of said at least

one activity and said at least one event (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 8-20; lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 46, a communications platform that enables individuals to receive XML (Shigemi: col. 9, line 20) electronic SmartMessages from corporations and others comprising a message-processing platform (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-57), said processing platform configured such that said platform is perceived to reside on said corporation's website (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 16-18), said platform providing automatic intelligent routing such that said corporation can route: said XML-based SmartMessage to an individual user (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 50-67).

Regarding claim 47, the communications platform in claim 46, further comprising the ability to receive an XML-based electronic SmartMessages from an XML SmartMessage sender (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 47-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al.

Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al (Applicant IDS).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,019 by Lewis.

Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,515 by Kumar.

Claims 39-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al (Applicant IDS).

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,019 by Lewis.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,549 by Bobo, II (Applicant IDS).

Claims 58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,046 by Johnson.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,046 by Johnson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier (Applicant IDS).

Claims 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,046 by Johnson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,549 by Bobo, II (Applicant IDS).

Claims 48, 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al

(Applicant IDS).

Claims 49-51 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 by Shigemi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 by Millier et al

(Applicant IDS) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,549 by Bobo, II (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 6,

The Millier reference teaches an electronic filing system for organizing structured

documents.

The Millier reference does not explicitly state the use of classes or entities in the

document definition.

The Shigemi reference teaches a system with SmartMessage definition documents

comprising an entity (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 50-58; objects) and a class (Shigemi: col. 10, lines

45-47).

The Shigemi reference further teaches this structured data management system gives

users the ability to customize and flexibly deal with data structures dealing with data objects and

their relationships (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 7-12, 17-23, 41-49).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the system of electronic filing and organizing structured documents as taught

by Millier while employing classes and entities in the document definition as taught by Shigemi

in order to give the user flexible control over data structures and objects and their relationships in

a data management system (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 7-12, 17-23, 41-49).

Claims 7-13 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Millier et al and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 7, the communications platform in claim 3, wherein said user-defined XML tag comprises a receipt document (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5; Shigemi: col. 10, lines 60-67), said receipt document specifies a SmartMessage processing server response (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 8, the communications platform in claim 2, further comprising an Informant stylesheet (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5) and a SmartMessage stylesheet (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 8-20), wherein said Informant stylesheet describes meta-data pertaining to the informant (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5), said SmartMessage stylesheet describes an activity and an event (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 8-20).

Regarding claim 9, the communications platform in claim 8, wherein said meta-data includes information pertaining to the Informant's name, website address, and industry category (Millier: col. 3, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 10, the communications platform in claim 8, wherein said Informant Stylesheet further authenticates the Informant (Shigemi: col. 15, lines 36-42; Figure 18).

Regarding claim 11, the communications platform in claim 8, wherein said

SmartMessage Stylesheet further describes the XML schemas of said activity and event

(Shigemi: col. 11, lines 64- col. 12, line 3), and defines how the activity and event is transmitted

to at least one endpoint (Shigemi: col. 12, lines 55-64; Figure 6).

Regarding claim 12, the communications platform in claim 1, wherein said at least one

endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a

paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-56).

Regarding claim 13, the communications platform in claim 8, wherein said Informant

stylesheet and said SmartMessage stylesheet reside on said Informant's web servers (Shigemi:

col. 10, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 17,

The Shigemi reference teaches a system of structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state the use rules based on user's preferences.

The Millier reference teaches an intelligent filing system wherein said rules for

communication are further based on the user's preferences and the attributes of a SmartMessage

(Millier: col. 3, lines 60 – col. 4, line 5).

The Millier reference further teaches an intelligent filing system that can automatically

organize information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2,

lines 1-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi while employing an intelligent filing system that uses rules for communications based on user preferences as taught by Millier in order to automatically organize the information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 28,

The Shigemi reference teaches a system of structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state acknowledging delivery of a message.

The Lewis reference teaches a communications platform, wherein said platform allows for the acknowledgement of the delivery of said SmartMessage (Lewis: col. 17, lines 17-22).

The Lewis reference further teaches this acknowledgement assures the accuracy of data and prevents duplicate entries (Lewis: col. 17, lines 23-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi while acknowledging delivery of messages as taught by Lewis in order to assure accuracy of data and prevent duplicate entries (Lewis: col. 17, lines 23-25).

Regarding claim 29,

The Shigemi reference teaches a system of structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state storing user profile data.

The Kumar reference teaches a communications platform, wherein said user is able to

store information pertaining to the user, said communications platform allowing said user of said

platform to access said information when said user visits at least one other website (Kumar: col.

3, lines 66- col. 4, line 19; send and receive and manipulate instances; where other website is just

another networked computer; Shigemi: col. 10, lines 13-20).

The Kumar reference further teaches a mechanism for managing a plurality of profile

objects in a readily scaleable and adaptable mechanism (Kumar: col. 3, lines 53-64).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi while storing

user profile information as taught by Kumar in order to provide a readily scaleable and adaptable

mechanism for managing a plurality of profile objects (Kumar: col. 3, lines 53-64).

Claims 30-31 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set

fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of

Kumar et al and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 30, the communications platform in claim 29, wherein said user is able

to access said information and transfer said information to said at least one other website

(Kumar: col. 3, lines 66- col. 4, line 19; send and receive and manipulate instances; where other

website is just another networked computer; Shigemi: col. 10, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 31, the communications platform in claim 30, wherein said information

comprises user's device addresses, settings, and default delivery options (Kumar: col. 3, lines 31-

34; Figure 4, col. 1, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 39,

The Shigemi reference teaches a system of structured data management where

information is organized into at least one activity and at least one event (Shigemi: col. 10, lines

8-20).

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state the intelligently storing, displaying and

synthesizing of messages into an information folio.

The Millier reference teaches a communications platform in claim 39, wherein said

organizing a received SmartMessage comprises intelligently storing, displaying and synthesizing

said SmartMessages received by the platform into said at least one information folio (Millier:

col. 3, lines 5-8, col. 2, lines 6-16).

The Millier reference further teaches an intelligent filing system that can automatically

organize information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2,

lines 1-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi while

employing an intelligent filing system that uses rules for communications based on user

preferences as taught by Millier in order to automatically organize the information into folders

based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2, lines 1-3).

Claims 40, 41, and 43 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections

set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings

of Millier et al and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 40, the communications platform in claim 39, wherein said at least one activity and said at least one event are sender definable (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5), said at least one event is applied to said at least one activity in said at least one information folio (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 54-57; where a folio is a node).

Regarding claim 41, the communications platform in claim 40, wherein said at least one activity comprises a bank statement, a retail order, a travel itinerary, a home alarm status or messages (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-57).

Regarding claim 43, the communications platform in claim 40, wherein a status of said at least one activity is updated based on the definition of the sender when said at least one event is applied to said at least one activity (Shigemi: col. 19, lines 9-16, 46-53).

Regarding claim 42,

The Shigemi reference teaches a communications platform that processes messages with respect to structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state the use of confirmation in its message processing.

The Lewis reference teaches a communications platform in claim 40, wherein said at least one event comprises a payment received, order confirmation, shipping confirmation, airline confirmation or an alarm triggered (Lewis: col. 17, lines 17-22).

The Lewis reference further teaches confirmation is a part of the verification process and ensures the accuracy of data by applying quality assurance rules to the data and allowing for corrections to errors or omissions to be made (Lewis: col. 17, lines 23-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications platform that processes messages with respect to structured data management as taught by Shigemi while employing a confirmation event as taught by Lewis in order to ensure the accuracy of data and allow for corrections to errors or omissions to be made (Lewis: col. 17, lines 23-33)

Regarding claim 44,

The Shigemi reference teaches a communications platform that processes messages with respect to structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state alerting a user upon receiving a message.

The Bobo, II reference teaches a communications platform in claim 43, wherein said individual user is alerted upon receiving a message from a sender (Bobo, II: col. 5, lines 21-22).

The Bobo, II reference further teaches that this system overcomes the problems that messages may go unnoticed for long amounts of time and that the routing process in an office may delay the delivery of documents to the intended receiver (Bobo, II: col. 2, lines 10-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications platform that processes messages with respect to structured data management as taught by Shigemi while alerting a user upon receipt of a message as taught by Bobo, II in order to overcome the problems that force messages to go unnoticed for

long amounts of time and that the routing process in an office may delay the delivery of

documents to the intended receiver (Bobo, II: col. 2, lines 10-19)

Regarding claim 48,

The Shigemi reference teaches a system of structured data management.

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state the use rules based on user's preferences.

The Millier reference teaches a communications platform in claim 46, wherein said

communications platform further provides the organization, summation, filing, storage, synthesis

and intelligent processing of XML-based electronic SmartMessages (Millier: col. 3, lines 5-8,

col. 2, lines 6-16).

The Millier reference further teaches an intelligent filing system that can automatically

organize information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2,

lines 1-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi while

employing an intelligent filing system that sorts messages by organization, summation, filing,

storage, synthesis as taught by Millier in order to automatically organize the information into

folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2, lines 1-3).

Claims 52, 53, 54, and 55 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the

rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant

teachings of Millier et al and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 52, the communications platform in claim 46, further comprising an

Informant stylesheet (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5) and a SmartMessage stylesheet

(Shigemi: col. 10, lines 8-20), wherein said Informant stylesheet describes meta-data pertaining

to the informant (Millier: col. 3, lines 60- col. 4, line 5), said SmartMessage stylesheet describes

an activity and an event (Shigemi: col. 10, lines 8-20).

Regarding claim 53, the communications platform in claim 52, wherein said meta-data

includes information pertaining to the Informant's name, website address, and industry category

(Millier: col. 3, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 54, the communications platform in claim 52, wherein said Informant

stylesheet further authenticates the Informant (Shigemi: col. 15, lines 36-42; Figure 18).

Regarding claim 55, the communications platform in claim 52, wherein said

SmartMessage Stylesheet further describes the XML schemas of said activity and event

(Shigemi: col. 11, lines 64- col. 12, line 3), and defines how the activity and event is transmitted

to at least one endpoint (Shigemi: col. 12, lines 55-64; Figure 6).

Regarding claim 51,

The Shigemi and Millier references teach a system of structured data management with

intelligent message processing with respect to email and various forms of communication

(Shigemi: col. 9, lines 41-57).

The Shigemi and Millier references do not explicitly state endpoint comprising telephones, facsimile machines, paging devices, and personal digital assistants.

The Bobo, II reference teaches the communications platform in claim 50, wherein said endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Bobo, II: col. 18, lines 18-30; col. 5, lines 27-29).

The Bobo, II reference further teaches this system overcomes the need for sophisticated and expensive systems that violate confidentiality of the message (Bobo, II: col. 3, lines 1-11)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi and Millier while employing an various endpoints of communication as taught by Bobo, II in order to overcome the need for sophisticated and expensive systems that violate confidentiality of the message when routing it to its destination (Bobo, II: col. 3, lines 1-11).

Claims 49, 50, 56, and 57 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Millier et al; Bobo, II; and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 49, the communications platform in claim 48, wherein said communications platform further comprises the ability for a user to access the communications platform by initially accessing the corporation's website (Bobo, II: col. 8, lines 9-34).

Regarding claim 50, the communications platform in claim 49, wherein said corporation can send SmartMessages to said user through at least one endpoint (Bobo, II: col. 8, lines 9-20).

Regarding claim 56, the communications platform in claim 55, wherein said at least one

endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a

paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-57; Bobo, II: col. 18, lines

18-30; col. 5, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 57, the communications platform in claim 52, wherein said Informant

stylesheet and said SmartMessage stylesheet reside on said Informant's web servers (Bobo, II:

col. 8, lines 9-34).

Regarding claim 58,

The Shigemi reference teaches a communications platform that enables individuals to

receive XML (Shigemi: col. 9, line 20) electronic SmartMessages from corporations and others

comprising a message-processing platform (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-57), said processing

platform comprising automatic intelligent routing such that said processing platform can receive

an XML-based electronic SmartMessages from an XML SmartMessage sender and route said

XML-based SmartMessage to an individual user at an endpoint (Shigemi: col. 9, lines 42-57; col.

2, lines 42-57).

The Shigemi reference does not explicitly state requiring receivers of messages to

respond.

The Johnson reference teaches a message processing system further comprising the

ability to require said individual receiving said XML SmartMessage to respond to said message

(Johnson: col. 7, lines 19-36).

The Johnson reference further teaches the system for communication activated processing

overcomes the problems of manual innovation that make it difficult for users to find and open the

correct applications associated with certain functions (Johnson: col. 1, lines 45-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the communications platform that routes XML SmartMessages as taught by

Shigemi while employing requiring recipients to respond to messages as taught by Johnson in

order to easily and quickly invoke applications among two users (Johnson: col. 1, lines 45-55)

Claim 60 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the

examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Johnson et

al and Shigemi et al.

Regarding claim 60, the communications platform in claim 58, wherein said

SmartMessage comprises information pertaining to the response, thereby allowing said

individual receiving said XML-based electronic message to respond to said message using said

endpoint (Shigemi: col. 2, lines 42-57; send and receive; col. 9, lines 42-57).

Regarding claim 59,

The Shigemi and Johnson references teach a system of structured data management with

intelligent message processing.

The Shigemi and Johnson reference does not explicitly state the organization, summation,

filing, storage, and synthesis of messages.

The Millier reference teaches the communications platform in claim 58, wherein said message processing platform further provides the organization, summation, filing, storage, synthesis and intelligent processing; of XML-based electronic SmartMessages (Millier: col. 3, lines 5-8, col. 2, lines 6-16).

The Millier reference further teaches an intelligent filing system that can automatically organize information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2, lines 1-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi and Johnson while employing an intelligent filing system that uses rules for communications based on user preferences as taught by Millier in order to automatically organize the information into folders based on the contents and profiles of usage (Millier: col. 2, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 61,

The Shigemi and Johnson references teach a system of structured data management with intelligent message processing with respect to email and various forms of communication.

The Shigemi and Johnson reference does not explicitly state endpoint comprising telephones, facsimile machines, paging devices, and personal digital assistants.

The Bobo, II reference teaches the communications platform in claim 60, wherein said endpoint comprises an electronic mail box, a wired or wireless telephone, a facsimile machine, a paging device, or a personal digital assistant (Bobo, II: col. 18, lines 18-30; col. 5, lines 27-29).

The Bobo, II reference further teaches this system overcomes the need for sophisticated

and expensive systems that violate confidentiality of the message (Bobo, II: col. 3, lines 1-11)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill

in the art to create the system of structured data management as taught by Shigemi and Johnson

while employing an various endpoints of communication as taught by Bobo, II in order to

overcome the need for sophisticated and expensive systems that violate confidentiality of the

message when routing it to its destination (Bobo, II: col. 3, lines 1-11).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,805,810 issued to Maxwell et al.

U. S. Patent No. 5,579,472 issued to Keyworth, II et al.

U. S. Patent No. 5,073,852 issued to Siegel et al.

U. S. Patent No. 5,828,314 issued to Park.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular

communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb
December 10, 2003

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER